(Lowell Re (see if complete

THE REMONSTRANCE
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, JANUARY, 1915

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

IN MASSACHUSETTS THIS YEAR

If the Massachusetts Legislature this year votes to submit to the electors the suffrage amendment upon which the Legislature last year voted favorably, Massachusetts Anti-suffragists, while regretting that the opportunity which they sought to have the judgment of the women of the state taken upon this question is not to be granted, will meet the issue with cheerful confidence.

They find in the meagre suffrage results of last November's elections,—in which two sparsely-settled mining states, with a combined population of less than half a million, accepted suffrage, while five states, with a combined population of more than ten millions, rejected it—evidence of a strong reaction against the suffrage movement.

They regard the vote in Ohio, where the majority against suffrage was more than twice as large as in 1912, as an indication that the suffrage cause is not gaining, but losing ground.

They believe that the decisive vote by which the woman-notaries amendment was defeated at the polls in this state in 1913 foreshadows a much heavier majority against the full-suffrage amendment.

They are confident that they can trust the men of Massachusetts not to thrust upon the women of the state, —against the wishes of a large majority of them—the burdens and responsibilities of the ballot.

And, in order that the majority against this proposal may be so large as to avert a recurrence of the agitation for years to come, they ask the assistance, in this campaign, of all Massachusetts men and women who realize how important are the issues at stake.

THE TURN OF THE TIDE

LAST November's elections mark the turn of the tide in the suffrage movement.

The suffragists chose to press the issue simultaneously in seven western and middle western states: Nevada, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Missouri and Ohio.

They were well organized, boastful, and abundantly supplied with funds.

Even in the largest of these states, they professed to be confident of victory.

Their confidence increased as the campaigns progressed. Oct. 3, The Woman's Journal reported joyously: *"Ohio is going to win. If Ohio wins, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Massachusetts will come in in 1915, and the country will have been carried for suffrage."* Oct. 31, three days before the election, The Woman's Journal reported "Victory seems certain in Nebraska." The suffrage leader in Missouri reported to the Journal: "Sentiment in favor of Amendment 13 is growing by leaps and bounds." The Woman's Journal of Oct. 31 said: "In all the campaign states, the women have high hopes of the result."

What happened to these high hopes?

The suffragists carried the two least important states,—Nevada, the most sparsely-settled state in the Union, with a total population less than that of the city of Lawrence, Massachusetts; and Montana, with a population about one half that of the city of Boston. They were defeated in the other five states.

Measured by population: the states which they carried have a population of 457,928. The states in which they made their appeal and lost have a population of 10,413,614.

Measured by female population: the whole number of females of all ages in the two states carried for suffrage is 178,505; in the five states which rejected suffrage, it is 5,028,595.

Measured by political power: the states in which the suffragists won elect three members of the national House of Representatives, and seven Presidential electors: the states where they lost elect 50 Representatives and 60 Presidential electors.

In one state—Ohio—there was a chance to determine whether the suffrage movement is gaining or losing strength. In 1912, the proposed amendment was defeated by a majority of 87,455; last November by a majority of 182,905.

Since the elections, the suffragists have been eager to disavow their "high hopes" and they represent themselves as greatly pleased with the meagre results of their campaigns. But they are really bitterly disappointed. They had hoped to win victories which would open the way to success in the states which are to vote upon the question next November. But there is nothing in the carrying of two such states as Nevada and Montana to make an impression upon public opinion in the East and the South.

Last April, THE REMONSTRANCE said:

"The suffrage movement has not gained a foot of territory through the vote of the male electorate, east of the Mississippi River. Not one of the New England states, not one of the Middle states, not one of the Southern states, not one of the Middle Western states has given full suffrage to women."

This statement is as true now as when it was made nine months ago. The strenuous and costly campaigns which the suffragists have made in seven states have not brought about any change in the situation.

THE REMONSTRANCE renews the prediction which it made last April that *"the year 1915 is destined to witness the heaviest defeats which the suffrage movement has yet experienced."*

A CRUSADE THAT FAILED

THE attempt of the Congressional Union last November to avenge itself upon the Democratic party because a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress had refused to favor woman suffrage was a gloomy failure.

The campaign was launched with deadly seriousness and a tremendous blowing of trumpets and beating of drums. The plan of campaign was simple and merciless. Democratic candidates for Congress from the suffrage states were to be defeated simply because they were Democrats and as a rebuke and chastening to the Democratic party.

Miss Alice Paul, leader of the Congressional Union, defined the scope and intention of the enterprise thus:

"The individual stand taken by any Senator or Representative, or any candidate for that office, does not affect our attitude in this contest. We are going to make it plain that it is political suicide for any party to ignore our demands or oppose the cause. We think we will make such a conclusive showing in the nine suffrage states that no party after that will oppose us."

Miss Paul also sent personal letters to all Democratic candidates in the suffrage states, to the following effect:

"While we feel no opposition to you as an individual and appreciate whatever service you may personally have rendered to the woman suffrage movement, it is apparent that your individual interest in suffrage can avail us little as long as your party, which is now in control of Congress, continues its unfriendly attitude toward our resolution. We realize that ours is a party government and that the will of the individual counts for little to that of his party.

"Since the party which you support persistently blocks our amendment and since, whatever your personal views on the subject may be, you are not able to make them effective owing to the opposition of the majority of your party colleagues, we are forced to regard you as an opponent together with the other members of your party."

When seasoned suffragists like Senator Thomas of Colorado were thus officially notified that their long devotion to the suffrage cause counted for nothing, in the estimation of Miss Paul and her associates, they gained some new impressions of the possibilities of women in politics. Senator Thomas, writing in obvious irony, sent this reply to Miss Paul:

"As an old and consistent advocate of woman suffrage I naturally appreciate the very kindly and approving attitude which your organization has assumed toward me. Having just returned from Colorado, however, I can assure you that the opposition of your organization is proving a source of real strength to me."

The Congressional Union chartered a special car, and sent its agents by twos into the suffrage states to make war upon all the Democratic candidates for the Senate and the House of Representatives. They based their campaign upon the assumption that Democratic women voters in those states would cheerfully give up their political principles and abandon the candidates who stood for them, for the sake of furthering the plans of the Congressional Union. But the Democratic women failed to respond.

In the nine suffrage states there were three Democratic Senators who were candidates for re-election; and there were thirteen districts in the House represented by Democrats. *The three Democratic Senators were all re-elected; and in the next House as in the present, there will be thirteen Democrats.*

In the rest of the country, the Democrats suffered heavy losses, as the party in power often does midway in an administration. Their plurality in the next House will be only 38 instead of 163 in the present.

That they should have held their own in the suffrage states while losing so heavily elsewhere shows how futile was the crusade of the Congressional Union. Apparently Senator Thomas was right in counting the opposition of the Union as a help.

A CHANCE THAT WAS MISSED

THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL of Nov. 7 said exultantly: "Nevada, with its 112,000 square miles, has extended the suffrage to women." The actual area of Nevada is 110,700 square miles, which seems big enough not to call for exaggeration. But was it through inadvertence that the Woman's Journal said nothing about population? It might have gone on to say that, dotted over this vast area, there are 17,000 women of voting age, or one for about every six square miles of territory. Or it might have said that Nevada is nearly as large as the state of New York and the six New England states combined—110,700 square miles as against 115,635—and that its entire population, 81,875, is very nearly as large as that of the city of Lawrence, Mass., 85,892. The Woman's Journal missed the chance to make these impressive comparisons.

WHICH MEANS THE MOST?

As an expression of popular feeling and as a foreshadowing of results in campaign states this year, which means the most:

That suffrage has carried in Nevada, where there is only one woman of voting age in every six square miles of area, and in Montana, another mining state of huge area and sparse population; or that it has been defeated in North and South Dakota and Nebraska, and overwhelmingly defeated in Ohio and Missouri?

THE PUBLIC INTERESTS LEAGUE

THE Public Interests League of the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association has carried on its Red Cross work very successfully during the last three months. Since the report of its activities in the October REMONSTRANCE, the work has grown with the growing needs of the European peoples involved in the great war. There have been days when as many as seventy women were busy at the headquarters, at 685 Boylston St.,—some cutting cloth, others sewing, others arranging and packing the finished garments. Altogether, more than a thousand different women have worked in the rooms. Besides the women from Boston and the suburbs who have toiled there for the wounded and suffering, there are many clubs, social or church organizations, engaged in the same work throughout the state, whose finished product has come to the League headquarters, to be sent to Brooklyn for shipment abroad. The women of every town and city in Greater Boston have contributed freely of their time and money; and although the League asks the assistance of Massachusetts women only, responses have come from as far north as Nova Scotia, as far west as California and as far south as New Mexico.

The Boston Evening Transcript, after describing two or three instances of needy women contributing through the League for those more needy than themselves,—a poor widow sending in her cherished red shawl, in the hope that it might go to some Belgian woman, and another, the widow of a Civil War veteran, selling her laces and heirlooms to give the proceeds for the purchase of materials—pictures thus the scene at the rooms:

"The headquarters of the League are an inspiring place. Every woman knows her branch of the work and keeps at it. The shears, in long, dexterous slashes, cut the goods, the machines hum as they lay and stitch the seams, the needles, in deft fingers, finish the garments for the soldiers; and, without delay, the comfortable and comforting clothing is packed in neat bundles, a fresh linen handkerchief showing in the pocket of each pajama jacket, night shirt, hospital shirt or lounging robe. Alongside, on the benches, are heaps of warm, woolly mufflers, socks, and hospital 'mules,' piles of inviting sheets and pillow-cases, and stacks of underwear, hoods, mittens, little dresses and big dresses for the women folk of the soldiers."

Communications regarding the work of the League may be addressed to Mrs. John Balch, President, 685 Boylston Street, Boston: Telephone Back Bay 2288.

WHAT IS THE USE OF A CONSTITUTION?

A CERTAIN New York politician, to whom it was once objected that the thing which he wished to do was unconstitutional, answered gaily, "What is the Constitution between friends?" He thereby gained a reputation of a sort and contributed to the public amusement.

The National Woman Suffrage Association, at its meeting in Nashville last November, appears to have been influenced by a similar sentiment. It went on record, without a dissenting vote, in favor of working for a bill in Congress, giving women the vote for Congressmen and United States Senators. The proposed bill is intended to enable women to vote for United States Senators and Representatives, as The Woman's Journal explains it, "without the elaborate procedure required to pass and ratify a National Constitutional Amendment." This "elaborate procedure" has bothered the suffragists a good deal for a long period of years, and it is easy to believe the statement of The Woman's Journal that the proposal "aroused a great deal of enthusiasm."

Looked at in the calm light of the express provisions of the Federal Constitution, there may be found some reason for abatement of enthusiasm. The second section of Article I of the Constitution provides "The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several states, and the electors in each state shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislatures."

Under Article XVII of the Amendments to the Federal Constitution which went into effect last November, it is provided that "The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each state elected by the people thereof for six years and each senator shall have one vote. The electors in each state shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislatures."

It will be noticed that the requirement in each case is identical, that the choice shall be made by electors who possess the qualifications necessary for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislatures.

Now in every state in the Union, with the exception of the suffrage states. the prime qualification for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislatures is that they shall be "male" citizens.

The idea that these provisions of the Federal Constitution can be swept away by a single bill enacted by a single Congress, "without the elaborate procedure required to pass and ratify a National Constitutional Amendment" is an "iridescent dream."

SETBACK FOR SUFFRAGISTS

(From Rutland, Vt., Herald, Nov. 5, 1914)

ONE of the notable features of the election in the nation at large is the unmistakable setback and rebuke received by the suffragists, militant and otherwise.

Sending out alleged facts about a public man's record, compiled by some pestiferous bureau in New York, and supplementing them with such additions as feminine ingenuity and a somewhat active malice may suggest, has not proven popular in Vermont or in other states where such tactics were pursued.

WHO THEN?

MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, President of the Ohio Suffrage Association, telegraphing from Warren, Ohio, to the Woman's Journal, Nov. 4, said:

"Drys did not generally vote for us. We made a splendid campaign."

The issue between "wets" and "drys" was never more clearly defined or more hotly contested than in Ohio last year. Not only was there before the voters a proposed amendment providing for state-wide prohibition; but there was an amendment of an entirely novel sort, framed in the interest of the "wets" and providing for "home rule and anti-prohibition."

These conflicting proposals divided the voters of Ohio into two hostile camps, the "wets" and the "drys." We have Mrs. Upton's word for it that the "drys" did not generally vote for suffrage. Where then did the suffrage vote mostly come from? Where could it have come from except from the other camp of the "wets"?

It is not the business of THE REMONSTRANCE to instruct the suffragists in political strategy, and it may seem an impertinence even to make a suggestion in that direction. But may it not some time occur to them that it is possible for them to carry their facing-both-ways policy too far? Their efforts to convince the liquor interests that they have nothing to dread from the votes of women may or may not succeed. But is there not a chance that, incidentally, sincere temperance advocates may be convinced that they have nothing to hope for from the votes of women?

Dr. Anna Shaw, the National leader of the Suffrage movement, took pains, last year, to circulate the following definite statement:

"The suffrage associations of the United States have never taken any stand upon the question of government control of the liquor traffic. . . . Just what the position of women voters upon the liquor problem will be has never been guessed, much less stated, by suffrage associations. *The opinions of individual suffragists are as varied as are those of anti-suffragists.*"

In Michigan, in the last campaign in that state, the Equal Suffrage Association published the following disclaimer: "Our Association has had no connection with the W. C. T. U. and we are not responsible for what the W. C. T. U. says or does. The temperance issue has nothing to do with Woman Suffrage."

And in Ohio, in this very campaign which has just closed so disastrously for the suffragists, Mrs. Upton herself formally stated:

"In the first place, let me explain that the suffrage association is not a temperance organization. *It has no connection whatever with the Anti-Saloon League.* It has just one article of faith, and that is to permit women to enjoy their long withheld political rights. This is of immensely more fundamental importance than any mere question of policy. When women vote they will be free to take sides on the liquor question. Many of them doubtless will vote dry. *Many others will vote wet.* A majority of them want the ballot for reasons entirely apart from the liquor question."

These assurances were obviously intended to conciliate the votes of the "wets." If they also alienated the votes of the "drys," have the suffragists any one but themselves to blame?

DR. SHAW AND SENATOR LODGE

IT must be that Dr. Shaw has some special animosity against Senator Lodge.

She included him in her blacklist of Congressional undesirables, whom the suffragists were to relegate to oblivion last November, in spite of the fact that his term does not expire until 1917. Dr. Shaw charged Senator Lodge with opposing "humanitarian measures of legislation,"—in particular the so-called "phossy-jaw" bill intended to suppress the manufacture of phosphorus matches.

The truth is that Mr. Lodge was the author of that bill, carried it through the Senate, and led the fight for it in two Congresses. Also, he introduced a child labor bill, which failed for constitutional reasons; supported a child labor bill for the District of Columbia; supported the La Follette bill regulating the hours of working women in the District, and two workmen's compensation bills; and took charge in the Senate of the Mann bill for the suppression of the white slave traffic.

The next time that Dr. Shaw singles out an eminent public man for direct personal attack she will perhaps investigate the facts first. The Massachusetts suffragists were so impressed by her folly in this instance that they adopted resolutions disclaiming responsibility for it.

HOW ANTI-SUFFRAGE IS GROWING

THE Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, during the year ending December 1st, 1914, distributed, in addition to thousands of fliers, 161,433 pamphlets and REMONSTRANCES. It obtained 7,882 new names. After deducting duplicates, deaths, removals from the state, and resignations, the net membership December 1, 1914, was 28,078 women of voting age, in 396 cities, towns and villages. It has received nearly 1,000 requests for literature, and has furnished material for 244 debates. It has held 215 meetings, exclusive of Committee Meetings. Twenty-eight new branches formed during the year make the present number 105.

WHAT SORT OF A LANDSLIDE IS THIS?

The Woman's Journal for October 3 predicted that "Ohio is going to win," and that success there "means a landslide in 1915, including New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and others."

But if suffrage success in Ohio would have meant that sort of a landslide; what sort of landslide does suffrage defeat by a majority of 182,905 mean?

"WOMEN AND WAR"

To the Editor of The Remonstrance:

It is time that the general American intelligence and conscience were aroused against the suffragist attempt to make capital out of the great war.

It began with a half-unconscious extension of the familiar patter expressing sex antagonism, and affirming the superiority of woman. Just as we have been told that, if women had the vote, there would be no bad drainage, no tenement-house fires, no tainted milk-supply and no infant mortality worth mentioning, we were assured that if women voted, there would be no wars.

But what began from the force of habit has been continued with the deliberate intention of turning one of the greatest calamities in the world's history into political ammunition.

In all the campaign states, and up and down Massachusetts, in halls, at street corners, on horseback and from yellow-trimmed automobiles, suffragist speakers have appealed for votes on this ground. Often it has been the bare assertion, without explanation or argument. Or when argument is attempted, it is insisted that women are the greatest sufferers by war. With a play upon words which seems out of place in discussing so serious a question, it is said that "if women do not bear arms, they bear the armies." Olive Schreiner is quoted as saying that "Woman will end war when her voice is clearly heard in the governance of states, because she knows the history of human flesh and its cost, and man does not." And again it is said, "If the mother's point of view had helped to shape the diplomacy of the countries of Europe, this terrible calamity might have been averted."

But war is a catastrophe which knows no limitations of sex. No man's voice has been raised anywhere to disparage or depreciate the part which women are taking in the present war. Sometimes, though rarely, it involves the same direct risk as with the men, as in the bombardment of Rheims, when Red Cross nurses were killed by the side of the wounded soldiers for whom they were caring. More often it is in the acute anguish of separation from husbands and sons, in broken homes and lifelong loneliness. Every one feels that the soldiers, who die miserably by the thousands in the trenches, suffer no more keenly and are no more truly patriots than the wives and children whom they leave behind. Never was there less occasion for raising the question of the relative burdens of the sexes.

But how about the "mother's point of view"? Is it really at variance in matters like this with the "father's point of view"? Would it be well for the world or would it be to the credit of women if it were?

Where the direct responsibility for the present war lies it would be idle and unjust to attempt to say. But no one can follow the diplomatic correspondence, which preceded the war, contained in the White Books and Gray Books and other official records, without discovering on both sides of disputed questions the assertion of principles, of rights, and of a readiness to make any sacrifices to preserve the national honor and the national existence.

If women directed the movements of diplomacy, would these considerations be left out of the "mother's point of view"?

To take the most conspicuous example and that concerning which there is least dispute: When Belgium was called upon at twenty-four hours' notice to choose between the preservation of its honor and independence, and practical annihilation, would its choice have been differently made if women had had a share in the government? And if tomorrow or next week Holland were called upon to make a like decision, would Queen Wilhelmina make a different choice from that of King Albert?

—*Frank Foxcroft.*

A BLACKLIST THAT DID NOT BLACKEN

THE plan of the Congressional Union for revenge for disappointments in Congress was to hold the Democratic party accountable and smash the Democratic candidates in the suffrage states. How the plan worked out is told elsewhere.

The plan of the National Suffrage Association was to present a blacklist of nine Senators and nine Representatives,—Democrats and Republicans—hand-picked for destruction.

The Senators selected as victims were: Lodge of Massachusetts, Root of New York, Brandegee of Connecticut, Clarke of Arkansas, Dillingham of Vermont, Fletcher of Florida, Gore of Oklahoma, Shively of Indiana, and Smith of Maryland.

What happened to them?

Mr. Lodge's term does not expire until 1917. Mr. Root was not a candidate for re-election.

Senators Brandegee, Dillingham, Clarke, Fletcher, Gore, Shively, and Smith were all re-elected.

The Representatives chosen for retirement were: Underwood of Alabama, Mann of Illinois, Fitzgerald of New York, Page of North Carolina, Galloway and Garner of Texas, Garrett of Tennessee, Hay of Virginia, and Sisson of Mississippi.

What was their fate?

Mr. Underwood was promoted to the Senate. The remaining eight were all re-elected.

It is probable that the suffrage leaders would give a great deal if they had not embarked upon this campaign of revenge and advertised it with such pomp.

HOW LONG WILL IT TAKE?

Suffrage was defeated in Michigan in November, 1912, by a majority of 760; in April, 1913, by a majority of 96,144. Suffrage was defeated in Ohio in September, 1912, by a majority of 87,455; it was defeated in November, 1914, by a majority of 182,905.

At this rate of progress, how long will it take for suffrage to sweep through the Middle West?

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women

One hundred and five Branch Committees; 28,420 members in 411 cities, towns, and villages*

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, President.
MISS MARY S. AMES.
MRS. JOHN BALCH.
MISS ANNA L. DAWES.
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD.
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL.
MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL.
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY.
Vice-Presidents
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer pro tem., Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS E. C. POST, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y. Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

* *Net present membership of women over 21 years of age: eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State*

BRANCH COMMITTEES

ACUSHNET
MISS EMILY A. BROWNELL, Chairman.

AMHERST
MRS. G. T. OLDS, Standing Committee.

ANDOVER
MRS. M. S. McCURDY, Standing Committee.

ARLINGTON
MRS. BENJAMIN A. NORTON, Chairman.

ASHLAND
MRS. HENRY E. DIX, Chairman.

BARNSTABLE AND HYANNIS
MRS. DAVID CROCKER, Chairman.

BARRE
MRS. ALEXANDER MARTIN, Chairman.

BELMONT
MRS. EDWIN F. ATKINS, Chairman.

BERNARDSTON
MRS. E. B. HALE, Chairman.

BEVERLY
MISS KATHARINE E. SILSBEE, Secretary.

BOSTON
MRS. BARRETT WENDELL, Chairman.

BREWSTER
MRS. HENRY E. ALLEN, Chairman.

BRIGHTON
MISS MARGARET W. COOPER, Chairman.

BROCKTON
MRS. ELROY S. THOMPSON, Chairman.

BROOKLINE
MRS. GEORGE K. SABINE, Chairman.

CAMBRIDGE
MRS. FRANK FOXCROFT, Chairman.

CANTON
MRS. C. I. PORTER, Chairman.

CHARLEMONT
MRS. LEWIS W. SEARS, Chairman.

CHELSEA
MRS. FREDERICK S. RADDIN, Standing Committee.

CHESTNUT HILL
MRS. HAROLD MURDOCK, Chairman.

CLINTON
MRS. S. IVES WALLACE, Standing Committee.

COHASSET
MRS. OLIVER H. HOWE, Standing Committee.

CONCORD
MRS. WOODWARD HUDSON, Chairman.

DANVERS
MISS MARGARET A. NICHOLS, Chairman.

DEDHAM
MRS. WILLIAM B. ROGERS, Chairman.

DORCHESTER
MRS. CHARLES F. DEWICK, Standing Committee.

DOVER
MRS. A. H. PARKER, Chairman.

EAST BRAINTREE
MISS LUCY M. CRANE, Secretary.

EVERETT
MRS. WILMOT R. EVANS, JR., Chairman.

FAIRHAVEN
MRS. GEORGE H. TRIPP, Chairman.

FALMOUTH
MRS. LEWIS C. WEEKS, Chairman.

FALL RIVER
MRS. C. A. BASSETT, Chairman.

FITCHBURG
MRS. GEORGE E. WALLACE, Chairman.

FRAMINGHAM
MISS A. F. TAYLOR, Secretary.

GLOUCESTER
MRS. J. O. PROCTOR, Chairman.

GREENFIELD
MRS. GEORGE P. TWITCHELL, Chairman.

GROTON
MRS. JOHN LAWRENCE, Chairman.

HAMILTON
MRS. REGINALD C. ROBBINS, Chairman.

HANOVER
MRS. A. L. SYLVESTER, Chairman.

HAVERHILL
MRS. GEORGE H. CARTER, Chairman.

HINGHAM
MISS ABBY A. BRADLEY, Chairman.

HOLLISTON
MRS. ALLAN V. GARRATT, Chairman.

HOPEDALE AND MILFORD
MRS. F. J. DUTCHER, Chairman.

HOPKINTON
MRS. CHARLES WALTER, Chairman.

JAMAICA PLAIN
MRS. CHARLES B. PERKINS, Chairman.

KINGSTON
MRS. H. M. JONES, Chairman.

LAWRENCE
MISS ISABEL ST. C. HERRICK, Chairman.

LEXINGTON
MRS. CHARLES B. DAVIS, Chairman.

LINCOLN
MRS. HENRY E. WARNER, Chairman.

LOWELL
MRS. G. H. PILLSBURY, Chairman.

MALDEN
MRS. TRUMAN R. HAWLEY, Chairman.

MANCHESTER
MRS. J. C. MACKIN, Chairman.

MARBLEHEAD
MRS. CHESTER L. DANE, Chairman.

MATTAPAN
MISS ADELINE B. REYNOLDS, Chairman.

MATTAPOISETT
MRS. JOHN C. SHAW, Chairman.

MEDFORD
MRS. CHARLES P. HOLYOKE, Chairman.

MELROSE
MRS. GRANT DRAKE, Chairman.

MILLIS
MRS. F. H. WILLIAMS, Chairman.

MILTON
MRS. JOHN BALCH, Chairman.

NAHANT
MRS. FRANK H. WILSON, Chairman.

NATICK
MRS. RALPH SWEETLAND, Secretary.

NEEDHAM
MISS GRACE MOSELEY, Chairman.

NEW BEDFORD
MRS. HERBERT C. CUSHMAN, Chairman.

NEWTON
MRS. FRANK A. DAY, Chairman.

NEWTONVILLE
MRS. MARCUS MORTON, Standing Committee.

NEWTON CENTRE
MRS. ELLIS SPEAR, JR., Chairman.

NORTH ADAMS
MRS. EZRA WHITAKER, Chairman.

NORTH ANDOVER
MISS KATE B. STEVENS, Chairman.

NORTH EASTON
MRS. S. S. EARLY, Chairman.

NORTHAMPTON
MISS JULIA WATSON, Chairman.

NORWOOD
MRS. R. M. WINSLOW, Chairman.

PEABODY
MRS. F. C. MERRILL, Standing Committee.

PITTSFIELD AND DALTON
MISS ANNA L. DAWES, Chairman.

PLYMOUTH
MRS. ARTHUR LORD, Standing Committee.

PRINCETON
MRS. RAYMOND GREGORY, Chairman.

PROVINCETOWN
MISS LOUISE C. PAINE, Standing Committee.

QUINCY
MRS. BROOKS ADAMS, Standing Committee.

ROSLINDALE
MISS MAUD G. LEADBETTER, Chairman.

ROXBURY
MRS. ALBERT F. HAYDEN, Chairman.

ROWE
MRS. GEORGE E. HANFORD, Chairman.

SALEM
MISS ELLEN B. LAIGHT, Chairman.

SHARON
MRS. WILLIAM E. CLARK, Chairman.

SOUTH BRAINTREE
MRS. WILLIAM GALLAGHER, Chairman.

SPRINGFIELD
MISS ANNIE C. STEBBINS, Chairman.

STOCKBRIDGE
MISS CAROLINE T. LAWRENCE, Chairman.

SWAMPSCOTT
MRS. ARTHUR F. BENT, Chairman.

TAUNTON
MRS. F. S. HALL, Chairman.

TOWNSEND
MRS. FRANK M. WARREN, Chairman.

WALTHAM
MRS. LOWELL E. WARREN, Chairman.

WAREHAM
MISS FRANCES HENNESSY, Chairman.

WELLESLEY HILLS
MRS. HELEN L. DODD, Chairman.

WENHAM
MRS. CHARLES PARKER, Chairman.

WEST NEWTON
MRS. JOHN W. WEEKS, Chairman.

WEST ROXBURY
MRS. J. W. ROLLINS, Chairman.

WESTON
MRS. WILLIAM BRAMHALL, Chairman.

WESTWOOD
MRS. THOMAS NELSON PERKINS, Chairman.

WHITINSVILLE
MRS. EDMUND M. TAFT, Chairman.

WILBRAHAM
MRS. CHARLES M. PEASE, Chairman.

WILLIAMSTOWN
MRS. J. FRANKLIN CARTER, Secretary.

WINCHESTER
MRS. GEORGE S. LITTLEFIELD, Chairman.

WOODS HOLE
MRS. W. O. LUSCOMB, Chairman.

WORCESTER
MRS. CHANDLER BULLOCK, Chairman.

"NO ONE'S BUSINESS"

MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT, President of the International Woman Suffrage Association, and presumably the highest living authority on questions relating to the movement, said at a meeting of pivotal importance in the recent Ohio campaign: "If women are given the ballot, what good will it do? How will they use it? I say that is not the question, and, to use a common, everyday phrase, it is no one's business."

Mrs. Catt went on to claim woman suffrage as a "right," irrespective of results. This argument always makes a certain rhetorical impression, but it is robbed of practical force by the glaring indifference of an overwhelming majority of women. The obvious difficulty which the suffragists find in rousing women to ask for the ballot proves conclusively to the average man that women are not suffering under a sense of injustice because they do not have it. They certainly do not seem to him to be behaving like people deprived of "rights." If he is to be convinced that they should have the ballot, he must be approached by that very line of argument which Mrs. Catt sets aside, and persuaded that what they do with it will improve the situation.

And it is not only the average man who must be persuaded—it is the average woman. Talk of "rights" does not appeal to her. By talk of duty she might have been won. Such talk we used to hear. Large issues, it used to be said, hung on woman's vote. The main strength of the suffragist appeal used to be that women would move forward irresistibly against vice of all sorts, a solid phalanx. But now—partly because of a genuine difference in ideals, partly because of the testimony of facts in the suffrage states—leading suffragists say frankly that they expect no solid woman's vote. They admit that women will "divide as men do," even on "moral questions."

That once having been admitted, the inducement to women to take up a line of activity for which most of them feel no inclination, is totally gone.

NO "EMERITUS" FOR HER

THE attempt of the "insurgents" to retire Dr. Anna Shaw from the Presidency of the National American Woman Suffrage Association failed.

The real motive of the attempt was delicately concealed. The petition to Dr. Shaw, which the "insurgents" signed, expressed "deep gratitude" to Dr. Shaw for her courage, loyalty and devotion, and asked her to become President Emeritus in order that she might be relieved of executive burdens, and "be at liberty to give her whole time from end to end of our country to making her magnificent pleas in the cause of equal suffrage."

That was very nicely expressed. Incidentally, it leaked out that the "insurgents" had a candidate for the succession in the person of Desha Breckinridge.

When the fact that the petition was in circulation percolated through to the newspapers, Dr. Shaw plainly declared that she would not consent. Later, when she was asked to "look the petition over," she flatly refused.

There are two facts which the "insurgents" seem to have overlooked but which may have been in Dr. Shaw's mind. One is that there are scores of suffrage orators, but only one National President. The other is that the compensation of the orators is irregular and variable; while the salary of the National President is definite and stable.

There were 318 delegates in attendance at the National Convention, of whom 283 took part in the election. Dr. Shaw received 192 votes—and 91 votes were blank! There were 109 delegates who signed the petition before the insurgent movement found itself in this impasse.

The Woman's Journal admits editorially that "much unnecessary heat was engendered" by the incident; and it adds that "many delegates who did not sign the petition expressed in private conversation their wish that Dr. Shaw were willing to take the step suggested in it."

It may be that this ends the "insurgency"; and it may be not.

"RISING REVOLT"

"There is rising revolt among women against the unspeakable dulness of unvaried home life. It has been a long, deadly routine, a life-servitude imposed on her for ages in a man-made world."

So wrote Miss Edna Kenton, a year ago, in her defence of the English militants, in The Century Magazine. Anti-suffragists pointed to the article as one proof more of their claim that the suffrage movement threatens the home. Suffragists of the conservative type hastened to disclaim it as the utterance of "an extremist." But such utterances are being made with more and more freedom, and it is becoming plain that there are many "extremists" among suffragist leaders.

Mrs. Rheta Childe Dorr, the editor of The Suffragist, has lately given to an interviewer of The New York World her argument for "economic independence." As the reviewer very justly remarks, "Mrs. Dorr is concededly a representative suffragist and feminist. She has campaigned for votes for women in a score of states, and during the last year has been assisting Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst in the preparation of her recently published autobiography. No one is better qualified to defend the right of the married woman to be a wage-earner."

"It isn't the right of the male to provide for his female," declared Mrs. Dorr, commenting on a statement made by Mrs. Annie Nathan Meyer in her new play, "The Spur." *"It isn't his pure, unselfish joy, either. It's his vain boast, his pet form of self-advertisement. Any sociologist*

will tell you how the day of the pampered, parasite female began. To show that he had conquered his enemy, primitive man wanted to sport some sort of a trophy. So he cut off and flourished his enemy's head or arm or leg . . . and for similar reasons he annexed the women folk of the fallen warrior. Fat and sleek and idle, they were a perpetual proof to the world that he, their master, was strong and rich and a very fine fellow. You may trace exactly the same motive in the action of the modern man who hangs a string of pearls around his wife's neck. . . . Men are not yet used to seeing their wives in the role of wage-earners. They'll have to get used to it, that's all. . . . I don't say that every married woman must go to work outside her home. I should commit suicide if I had to spend my life doing housework, but some women probably like it. Let them do it then. All that I ask is that every woman, married or single, should be allowed to choose the work in which she finds most pleasure.'

"To choose the work in which she finds most pleasure"—there is the real individualistic note, sounded so often by the radical suffragists. It is struck still more clearly when the reporter asks: "What about the argument that the wife with a business career is apt to deprive her husband of the joys of fatherhood?" *"No one but the individual woman herself,"* answers Mrs. Dorr, *"has any right to decide whether or not she shall have children. That is a question which she alone is entitled to settle. . . . If the grind of office work bears hardly upon women, so it does upon men. I don't see that it is any worse for one than for the other. . . . Anyway, no profession or business could be more of a strain than the shut-in monotony of a household career."*

In the same tone of contempt for the domestic round in which the average wife and mother has been accustomed to find her fair share of human satisfaction, Mrs. Susan W. Fitzgerald writes in the opening number of a new magazine:

"Her work is hopelessly mechanical, an endless chain of petty routine which she performs for the comfort it brings her family, but which gives her little stimulus. For the satisfaction of creative work, of stimulative endeavor toward a satisfying end, the woman of to-day goes forth from her home even as her husband does and finds professional work that meets her need—finds it and is happy in it; and why not? If she does such work she can then, without drawing unfairly upon his earnings, provide trained persons,—specialists to run the machinery of her home better than she herself can do it. She can return to her home at the close of the day and look upon it not as a cage in which she has been confined nor as a whirligig of chores which she has been frantically pacing all day, only to find herself at night at the same point from which she started in the morning, but as a place of real rest and pleasure."

Again the contempt shows itself. *"Of course,"* says Mrs. Fitzgerald, *"some women don't want to do independent work; some prefer the quiet routine and detail of the home and are satisfied to make a profession of its many little refinements, even as many men have not the ambition to go into business for themselves. Such persons —men or women—like their amusements quite separate from their work and never dream of confusing them. But the creative artist, whether in a profession or business, gets most of the joy of living out of the satisfaction that comes to him in his work, and so I say, Do away with the prejudice against married women working outside their homes."*

Neither of these theorists, it will be noticed, is pleading for the married woman whose circumstances are exceptional. In her case, we should all agree, there ought to be no "prejudice" against her working outside her home.

But it is the case of the average woman that is under consideration, and it is quite plain that the theory of both these suffragists agrees with that set forth so brilliantly by Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, in The Woman's Journal, ten years ago: *"The woman should have as much to do in the home as the man—no more."* Indeed, Mrs. Fitzgerald expressed herself unmistakably on the point five years ago, in an interview in the Boston Herald:

"I agree with Mrs. Belmont that women ought to earn their living after they are married. The necessity for the economic independence of woman after marriage is one of my strongest beliefs. . . . Nor need a wife's continuing to work interfere with her having children. . . . Any woman who is valuable in her profession can afford to take six weeks' vacation once in two or three years. . . . Women will never get along well in business, until, like men, they look at their professions as permanent things."

On theories like these Ida Tarbell comments shrewdly: "The ranks of the women celibates are not full. Many a candidate falls out by the way, confronted by something she had not reckoned with—the eternal command that she be a woman. She compromises—grudgingly. She will be a woman on condition that she is guaranteed economic freedom, opportunity for self-expressive work, political recognition. What this amounts to is that she does not see in the woman's life a satisfying and permanent end."

Contrast the woman who does "see in the woman's life a satisfying and permanent end" with the woman who is in revolt "against the unspeakable dulness of unvaried home life." Which type does society need?

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE

IT is to be hoped that Missouri suffragists may not become superstitious because their proposal, which went down to overwhelming defeat, figured on the ballot as Amendment No. 13.

"ONE reason why suffrage was defeated in Ohio," says Miss Lucy Price —an Ohio newspaper-woman herself —"was because none of the suffrage speakers who came there from suffrage states could tell of as good laws in their own states as those in Ohio."

JUDGE OWEN of Chicago, who is zealous to give the suffragists everything they ask for, ruled that women could vote for county commissioners. But the Illinois Supreme Court overruled his decision, and the women's votes were thrown out.

WALTHAM furnishes another example of the fluctuations in women's school vote, almost as striking as that of Cambridge two or three years ago. In December, 1913, only 177 women took the trouble to vote. Last December, 1456 women registered in a single day, and 1,500 voted.

THOSE suffragists who favor prohibition and urge "votes for women" as a means of extending it, must be intensely relieved that some woman-suffrage states have at last made their way into the prohibitory column. But the ugly fact still remains that eleven male-suffrage states were there before them.

THE Lincoln, Neb., Journal calls attention to the fact that, in that state, it was the country vote that defeated woman suffrage. Lincoln voted for it; and Omaha gave only a small majority against it, but the farmers remained unconvinced. This does not accord with the suffrage claim that it is the saloons and the underworld that defeat suffrage.

THE amazing effrontery of the Pankhursts never found more characteristic expression than in Christabel's answer to the New York reporter who questioned the right of the militants to destroy property—"The Rokeby Venus has been repaired, and people still go to see it. In fact, I think more people know about it than ever before because of what we did."

IT must have been in a moment of forgetfulness that The Springfield Republican said editorially: "As bearing upon the effect of votes for women compare Illinois with Pennsylvania. Roger Sullivan was defeated, while Penrose was mightily a winner." But this comparison has no bearing upon votes for women, for the excellent reason that Illinois women had no vote for United States Senator.

THE Massachusetts Political Equality League thought it would do a little Congressional Union venture on its own account; and it sent its state organizer down to New Bedford for a ten-days' campaign to defeat Senator Andrew P. Doyle, whose crime was that he had voted against woman suffrage. But, like the Democratic Congressional candidates in the suffrage states, Senator Doyle came out of the affair with a bigger majority than he had a year ago.

JUDGE DAVID CROSS, whose death has occurred since the last issue of THE REMONSTRANCE, was the oldest alumnus of Dartmouth, and one of the best-beloved men in his city,—Manchester, N. H. Judge Cross was a vigorous and consistent opponent of woman suffrage. He arranged the meeting which resulted in the formation of the first Anti-suffrage Association of New Hampshire, which defeated woman suffrage there in the constitutional convention of 1912.

BOSTON SUFFRAGISTS thought it wise under existing conditions, to draw the line at Miss Christabel Pankhurst, and the Ohio suffragists took the same view of her; but the New York, Connecticut and Minnesota suffragists knew no such scruples. Miss Pankhurst, who arrived at New York under an assumed name, was hospitably entertained by Mrs. Belmont, and in Washington by Mrs. Edward B. McLean; and she was enthusiastically received by the Southern States Suffrage Conference at Chattanooga.

THE contradictory claims of suffrage speakers would make amusing reading in parallel columns. Says Mrs. George Bass, of Chicago: "A man's life is simple beside that of the average woman . . . No wonder the men have been the inventors, the poets, the musicians, the great dreamers of the world. Women have been too busy cooking their meals and bearing their children to do such things. The men have had plenty of time." Says Miss Grace Simons, of Pasadena; "Women are the leisure class of this country."

WITH their increasing activity in local politics, the suffragists have opportunity to display on a larger scale their ideals of gracious womanhood. Mrs. Agnes M. Jenks, chairman of the legislative committee of the Woman Suffrage party in Rhode Island, complained bitterly during the last campaign that a certain candidate met a party of women "with marked rudeness." Speaking a few days later at an open-air rally, Mrs. Jenks said: "There are thirty-five men serving in the state legislature who are not fit to represent a community of cats." Honors even?

THE Connecticut suffragists gave out an official statement before the election to the effect that "Since the Republican party turned down the plea of the women for the insertion of a suffrage plank in their platform, while the Democrats gave their cordial endorsement to the demand that the question should be presented by the legislature to the voters, it is easy to see on which side the sympathies of the suffragists will be enlisted. Every candidate who is known to be unfavorable to woman suffrage will be the object of the women's opposition." In the present Congress, the Connecticut representation in the House is solidly Democratic. In the next House, it will be solidly Republican. Somehow, the Republican party seems not to have suffered much for offending the suffragists.

A LONG WAY TO LEGISLATION

AMONG many of the women who ask for the ballot because they sincerely believe that by its use they can bring about the enactment of better laws, there is a great deal of confusion regarding the processes of legislation. It seems to them a simple thing to get a desirable statute enacted. You have only to state your case before the proper committee and the thing is done. If you have a vote with which to enforce your wishes, you can feel confident of success.

But the thing is by no means so simple. If Mrs. Smith, who wants a certain measure enacted, has a vote, so also has Mrs. Jones, who wants it defeated. A proposed law, if of any importance, affects adversely some persons or some interests, and the mere suggestion of it arouses them to active opposition. It is necessary to convince legislators that it is safer to vote for it than to vote against it; or that it is so clearly for the public good that the opposition of individuals or interests adversely affected by it may be disregarded.

The processes of legislation do not begin with the meeting of the Legislature, or the appointment of committees; but with the nominations at the primaries. There are, in this state, 240 members of the House and 40 members of the Senate to be chosen; and any given proposal must commend itself, or be forcefully commended, to at least 121 members of the House and 21 members of the Senate. Yet, in the selection of candidates at the primaries, and later, in voting for them at the polls, Mrs. Smith can bring her influence to bear only upon a single Representative and a single Senator. To make her influence effective even in the selection of that one Representative and that one Senator, she needs the coöperation of a good many other voters.

And, at the very outset, in the exercise of this influence, puzzling questions arise. Shall the one question which interests Mrs. Smith be the only question to be taken into account in the nomination and election of candidates? Candidate Brown promises to vote for the proposed legislation. But he is a man of conspicuously bad character; or he is committed to the support of conspicuously bad measures. He will vote for the proposal which Mrs. Smith has at heart; but he will also vote for dozens of bills of which she strongly disapproves,—or would disapprove, if she had taken the trouble to look into them. On the other hand, Candidate Robinson is not convinced of the wisdom or the practicability of Mrs. Smith's measure; but he is not influenced in his attitude by selfish considerations. He is straightforward and high-minded, and can be counted upon to support every proposal which seems to him to be for the public good.

Now what shall Mrs. Smith do about it? Shall she help to nominate and elect Candidate Brown,—in spite of all that she knows to his disadvantage as to his character or his following? Or shall she help to nominate and elect Candidate Robinson, because of his high character and spotless record, in the hope of convincing him later of the rightfulness and importance of the measure which she wants to see enacted? In other words, shall she determine her action at the primary and at the polls, by consideration of the one measure which she has in mind, or by general considerations of the characters and records of candidates? Shall she help to elect the bad candidate, merely because he promises support to her measure? Shall she help to defeat the good candidate, merely because he is not convinced of the wisdom of her measure?

These are grave questions, and it will take some time for Mrs. Smith to decide them, if she really has the public good at heart. Also, it will require a good deal of time and strength and energy, if Mrs. Smith is to make her decision effective,—beginning away back before the primary and continuing until final action is taken in the Legislature. She cannot be content with action in her own district; but she must organize sentiment in other districts to re-enforce her.

And, in carrying through, or in trying to carry through the desired legislation, she will lose the non-partisanship which is now one of her chief assets. She will have to make her appeal as a Democrat to Democrats, or as a Republican to Republicans, or as a Progressive to Progressives. This means a sharp limitation to her influence. Now, her appeal is made to legislators without distinction of party or any political or selfish considerations. But, with the ballot in her hand, she can appeal effectively only to her own party.

Under these conditions, it would not take long to convince her that, in reaching out for the ballot, she had greatly circumscribed her influence for good, instead of enlarging it, as she dreamed of doing.

"MEN WITH FOREIGN NAMES" AGAIN

DR. ANNA SHAW seems obsessed with her idea that "men with foreign names" have no proper place in American public life.

So long ago as May, 1911, she declared that "Senator Grady and men like him, bearing foreign names, should not have the right to vote on a question of this sort."

Last April, at a crowded suffrage meeting in Tremont Temple, Boston, she said with still more bitterness: *"There is not another country in the world that has submitted its women to the humiliation that American men have reduced their women to. German women are governed by German men. French women are governed by French men; but American women are governed by every kind of a man under the sun."*

Last summer and fall, Dr. Shaw went up and down the western campaign states, using this identical language.

To be consistent, Dr. Shaw should ask the ballot only for women of "American names"; but questions of consistency do not trouble her.

THE CONQUEST OF NEVADA

It does not often happen that the story of a conquest is told by the person who does the conquering. Usually we have to rely upon tradition, or the narratives of persons writing long after the incidents described. But in the case of the conquest of Nevada by the suffragists last November, we have the direct narrative of the person most concerned.

It was our own Miss Margaret Foley, and she told the story in her usual shy and diffident way in the Boston Herald for Nov. 18. "I left Boston early in September," she said, "and worked night and day from the time I set foot in Nevada. I saw and danced and gossiped with every voter." It is likely that Miss Foley exaggerates a little at this point for, small as is the voting population of Nevada, the time which she indicates would hardly have been sufficient to go completely around in this unusual sort of campaign. Distances in Nevada are vast, and the voters are scattered at the rate of one for every six or eight square miles. But, as Miss Foley explains that she was most of the time on horseback and that automobiles were pressed into service and that she used up four $40 mileage books in crossing the state, she evidently covered a good deal of ground.

One incident of her campaign she describes thus: "One night I had to take a fifty mile trip through the hills with a couple of drunken cowboys. After they awoke from a sleep on the floor of the coach, they started to shoot up the conveyance. I took their revolvers away from them and had them teach me shooting."

Modestly as this incident is told, it serves at least to show that Miss Foley was equal to any emergency, and furnishes in itself, so far as it goes, an argument more or less conclusive in favor of equal rights. Also it corroborates Miss Foley's final statement: "Why did Nevada gain suffrage? Just because of what we women did. We showed the men that we could campaign as well as they could."

BLISSFUL IGNORANCE

It will be remembered that when The Atlantic Monthly, last winter, published an exposition of feminism which gave wide offense by the radical views expressed, and brought much embarrassment to the suffrage movement, which it claimed as "but part of the greater propaganda," conservative suffragists made haste to discredit its author, Mr. W. L. George, as an unknown individual without prestige or reputation. The editor of The Woman's Journal said flatly to a Boston reporter: "As for this Mr. George . . . I never heard of him."

In the interval since Mr. George—to use his own phrase—"let the cat out of the bag," there has been ample opportunity to hear of him.

In January, The Living Age reprinted from The British Review an article by Mr. George on "Religious Drama."

In February, The Bookman (New York) published from his pen an eight-page article on the younger novelists of the day. In the same month, The Bookman (London) printed his appreciation of the fiction of D. H. Lawrence.

In March, a novel of his own, "The Making of an Englishman," was published in the United States by Dodd, Mead & Co. A review in The Atlantic for October calls it "an extraordinary and brilliant performance, though it is safe to say there are few English writers who would care to be responsible for it."

In April, a critical essay, "Form and the Novel," appeared in The Living Age.

In May, a London publisher brought out a study of modern drama, called "Dramatic Actualities."

In June, The Bookman drew upon him for its review of Mrs. Gallichan's "The Age of Mother-Power."

In November, he again appeared as an Atlantic contributor, this time in lighter vein, with an essay called "Uniforms for Women."

In the same month The Bookman (London) announced a new novel by W. L. George, "The Second Blooming."

Incomplete as this enumeration is, it serves to show that the writer whom suffragists pooh-poohed so easily, a year ago, commands a considerable circle of readers, and exerts a corresponding influence. There are many such writers of whom conservative suffragists would prefer never to have heard. But their writings cannot be ignored, nor their claims that their views represent the ultimate freedom toward which the suffrage movement is but one step.

MISS AGNES IRWIN

Miss Agnes Irwin, a Vice-President of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women since 1908, died at Philadelphia, December 6, 1914. Miss Irwin was one of the most widely known of women educators in this country. Beginning her career at the age of 21, as teacher in a private school in New York City, she became, eight years later, the head of a private girls' school in Philadelphia. She remained there for 25 years, making the school a leader of its kind. In 1894, she was called to be Dean of Radcliffe College, which became in that year a distinct institution, after fifteen years of existence as the "Harvard Annex." She resigned that position in 1909. She had a large share in the development of the college during the fifteen years of her official connection with it. She was greatly respected and beloved by the thousands of girls and young women with whom she was intimately associated during her long educational career; and she exerted a wide, beneficent and conservative influence. She received honorary degrees of LL.D. and Litt.D. from the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of St. Andrews', Scotland; and served for two years on the Massachusetts Commission on the Adult Blind.

GLITTERING GENERALITIES

THE campaign oratory of the suffragists continues to display those glittering generalities that have characterized the movement from its start.

Mrs. Paul Gerhardt, candidate for nomination as alderman in Chicago, last spring, offered as one of the planks in her platform: "The removal of poverty from the ward by finding out the cause and remedying it."

Mrs. Eva Morley Murphy, a defeated candidate for Congress in Kansas, this fall, outdistanced Mrs. Gerhardt with the creed: "To make life safer and happier for the people of the United States."

Rabbi Fleischer, addressing the Massachusetts Federation of Progressive Women, declares that "men have been a failure as world-rulers, and it is now time the women took a try at it."

Miss Minnie Mulry, campaigning for the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association, says: "The corrupt politician is afraid of the woman's vote because, while he can fool the men and does fool them, he can't fool the women."

Still more invincible is the optimism of Jane Addams, who has lately told an audience of Boston suffragists: "Women are valuable in politics because they are not afraid of failure; men hate to be defeated."

"THE APATHY OF THE WOMEN"

FROM the "heart to heart" talks of suffragists among themselves, facts emerge, now and then, of interest to the outside world. No Anti-suffragist could wish for stronger proof than some of these give, of the indifference of women to the ballot.

Mrs. Walter McNab Miller, president of the Missouri Suffrage organization, when campaigning for signatures to the petition to submit the suffrage amendment which was later defeated at the polls by a majority of more than 140,000, said: "Curiously enough, in our travels over the state, it has more often been the apathy of the women that must be overcome than the opposition of the men."

"General" Rosalie Jones, of "hiking" fame, reported from a canvass of four of the "campaign states," "The men are entirely willing to give women the vote if they want it; our only work is in rousing the desire ot the women."

Even enrolled suffragists are not so eager for "enfranchisement" as their leaders would fain have the public believe. Mrs. Virginia Brannan, who has been doing suffrage work in Iowa for thirty years, speaking of conditions in that state at the convention of the Tennesee Association, referred to the "comparatively small number who will get out and work." And Rheta Childe Dorr—who disputes with Inez Milholland Boissewein the role of *enfant terrible* to the suffrage movement—at a meeting held in New York City immediately after the disappointing elections of November, bade suffragists there take warning by the result in Nebraska, where the women, she said, lost their amendment because they "didn't get out and work."

It is becoming so plain that there is no widespread demand for the ballot among women that those who urge it are forced to find other arguments. Mrs. Marion Booth Kelley, one of the ablest suffragists in Massachusetts, says: "Because certain women do not want the ballot is no reason why they should not have it. Children don't see why they should go to school. Women need the ballot for their own moral awakening." Professor Lewis J. Johnson, of Harvard University, sent to a Boston paper, last year, with his own endorsement, a more extreme expression from the pen of Joseph Fels: "It is undeniable that the great majority of the slaves did not desire freedom. . . The very fact that some women do not desire to vote is a prime reason, not for forcing it on them, but for offering it to them, in order that by its voluntary exercise their characters may be broadened and improved. I take off my hat to women who resent injustice; I pity those who hug their chains."

At the last hearing before a Massachusetts legislative committee, after an agitation of more than fifty years, the suffragists were able to claim an enrolment of only 40,000—about one in twenty-eight of the female population of the state. Can any sane person believe that the enormous majority who did not figure on the suffragist list are either "children who don't see why they need to go to school," or "slaves hugging their chains"? Can any candid person recommend that the ballot to which such an overwhelming majority is either indifferent or actively opposed shall be forced on them "for their moral awakening"?

SUFFRAGE DEFEATS LAST YEAR

IN CONGRESS

In the Senate, March 19, a resolution providing for the submission of an equal suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated. The vote stood 35 to 34, 27 Senators not voting. This was 29 votes short of the required two-thirds.

IN THE LEGISLATURES

In South Carolina, January 25, the House rejected unanimously a proposed suffrage amendment.

In Mississippi, January 22, the House defeated a similar proposal, 80 to 42.

In Maryland, February 18, the House of Delegates rejected the proposed amendment, 60 to 34.

In Virginia, the House of Delegates killed the proposed amendment, 74 to 13.

In Kentucky, the House took similar action, 51 to 29.

In Rhode Island, the suffrage proposals were killed in committee.

AT THE POLLS, NOVEMBER 3

(Official returns to The Remonstrance from the Secretaries of State)

OHIO: Yes, 335,390; No, 518,295. Majority against, 181,420.

NEBRASKA: Yes, 90,738; No, 100,842. Majority against, 10,104.

MISSOURI: Yes, 182,257; No, 322,463. Majority against, 140,206.

NORTH DAKOTA: Yes, 40,011; No, 49,670. Majority against, 9,659.

SOUTH DAKOTA: Yes, 39,605; No, 51,519. Majority against, 11,914.

(Note: the majority in favor of suffrage in Nevada was 3,679; in Montana, it was 3,714.—a total of 7,393. The majorities against suffrage in the five states in which it was defeated aggregated 253,303.)